



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,792	05/13/2002	Philippe Schottland	GEPL.P-051	1633
43247	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
OPPEDAHL & LARSON LLP			PATTERSON, MARC A	
PO BOX 5068			ART UNIT	
DILLON, CO 80435			PAPER NUMBER	
			1772	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/063,792

Applicant(s)

SCHOTTLAND, PHILIRPE

Examiner

Marc A Patterson

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 28-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 28-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 28-41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 40 – 41 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 40 – 41 are amended, but Claims 40 – 77 have been cancelled. Appropriate correction is required.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

2. The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of Claims 1 – 2, 9, 13 – 15, 22 and 42 as being anticipated by Kozak et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,497), of record on page 3 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 10, 13 – 23 and 28 – 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozak et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,497) in view of Cornell et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,873,390) and Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 5,086,937).

With regard to Claims 1 and 28 – 29, Kozak et al disclose an article (sign, therefore not a lamp lens or bezel; column 4, lines 30 – 31) comprising a molded body (column 7, lines 32 – 34) formed from a plastic composition having an index of refraction of 1.6 (column 4, lines 50 – 51) and a fluorescent material (fluorescent glass, therefore photoluminescent and having a

Art Unit: 1772

fluorescent dye; column 4, lines 23 – 25) wherein the article has a graphic image (shape; column 4, line 36) formed as protrusions on a surface thereof (the reflection of the image is enhanced by providing spheres which are embedded half – way in the medium comprising the sign and therefore are protruding from the medium; column 4, lines 63 – 66) and therefore provide a luminescent visual effect in the shape of the graphic image. Kozak et al fail to disclose an article in the form of a bottle having an annular portion and comprising a bottle having a bottom and a sealable top portion and an integrally molded handle.

Cornell et al teach that signs and labels are equivalent as photoluminescent articles (photoluminescent films are used interchangeably in both applications; column 1, lines 50 – 51) for the purpose of obtaining articles having long glow life (column 1, lines 60 – 61).

Robinson teaches the application of a label to a bottle having a sealable top portion (therefore also having a bottom; column 1, lines 44 – 49) and annular body portion (opening; column 4, line 21) and integrally molded handle (column 4, lines 31 – 33) for the purpose of obtaining a bottle that is capable of resisting deformation (column 4, lines 54 – 58). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the advantage of providing for the label of Cornell et al in Kozak et al depending on the desired glow life of the end product as taught by Cornell et al, and of providing for the label of Kozak et al and Cornell et al to the labelled bottle of Robinson, thus obtaining an article having substantially annular body portion and comprising a bottle having a bottom and a sealable top portion and an integrally molded handle, depending on the desired resistance to deformation of the end product as taught by Robinson.

It therefore would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have provided for a label in Kozak et al in order to obtain an

Art Unit: 1772

article having a long glow life as taught by Cornell et al and to have provided for a labeled bottle in Kozak et al in order to obtain obtain a bottle that is capable of resisting deformation as taught by Robinson.

With regard to Claims 2, 9, 22 30 and 32, the fluorescent material disclosed by Kozak et al comprises an organic fluorescent dye comprising xanthene (pigment comprising xanthene; column 7, lines 24 – 26).

With regard to Claims 3 – 8, 10 16 – 21, 23, and 33 – 38, Kozak et al fail to disclose a dye having a concentration of 0.1% to 0.005% and 0.0001 to 0.0003% by weight and a dye providing a red or blue visual effect and a photoluminescent material comprising a material of nanosize. However, Kozak et al disclose a fluorescent dye having a concentration of at least a fraction of 1% fluorescent dye (the material comprises fluorescent dye; column 7, lines 24 – 26) and particle size of 2 mm (column 9, lines 44 – 45) and teaches the selection of concentration and color of the dye (column 6, line 41) based on workability and cost (column 6, line 37). Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the utility of varying the concentration and color and particle size of the dye to obtain a desired workability and cost. Therefore, the workability and cost would be readily determined through routine optimization of concentration and color and particle size of the dye by one having ordinary skill in the art depending on the desired end use of the product.

It therefore would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the concentration and color and particle size of the dye in order to obtain a desired workability and cost, since the workability and cost would be readily determined through routine optimization by one having ordinary skill in the art depending on the desired end result as shown by Kozak et al.

Art Unit: 1772

With regard to Claims 14 – 15 and 31, the plastic disclosed by Kozak et al is polycarbonate (column 7, lines 31 – 32).

With regard to Claims 13 and 39, the images are formed from protrusions having a height of 1 mm (the spheres are beads having a diameter of 2 mm; column 9, lines 44 – 45).

5. Claims 11 – 12 and 40 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kozak et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,497) in view of Cornell et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,873,390) and Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 5,086,937) and further in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,580).

Kozak et al, Cornell et al and Robinson disclose an article comprising xanthene as discussed above. With regard to Claims 11 – 12 and 40 – 41, Kozak et al fail to disclose xanthene having a quantum yield of 0.9 or greater. However, Lee teaches that xanthene has a quantum yield of 0.93 (column 1, line 24). A quantum yield of greater than 0.9 or greater is therefore inherent to Kozak et al, Cornell et al and Robinson.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of Claims 1 – 2, 9, 13 – 15, 22 and 42 as being anticipated by Kozak et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,497), 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 3 – 8, 10, 16 – 21, 23 and 64 as being unpatentable over Kozak et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,497), 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 11 – 12 as being unpatentable over Kozak et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,497) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,580) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of Claims 24 – 41, 43 – 63 and 65 – 67 as being unpatentable over Kozak et al

Art Unit: 1772

(U.S. Patent No. 5,660,497) in view of Cornell et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,873,390) and Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 5,086,937), of record in the previous Action, have been carefully considered but have not been found to be persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant argues, on page 7 of the remarks dated September 30, 2004, that the rejection is improper because the claimed photoluminescent material is in the body of the bottle, not merely in a label applied to the bottle, and the protrusions are not formed by applying beads as in Kozak.

However, as stated above, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term 'bottle' in amended Claim 1, which is directed to an article having 'the form of a bottle.' For purposes of examination, the claimed article will be interpreted to be a bottle or any other article having a bottle or bottle-like shape. Furthermore, Claim 1, which is directed only to an article having protrusions, does not exclude protrusions formed by the presence of beads.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1772

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Patterson, whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 1497. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached at (571) 272 - 1498. FAX communications should be sent to (703) 872-9310. FAXs received after 4 P.M. will not be processed until the following business day.

Marc A. Patterson, PhD.

Marc Patterson
Art Unit 1772

Harold Pyon
HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772

12/10/04